

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by St. Louis University. Subscription price: \$1.00 a Year.
Entered as second-class matter at St. Louis, Mo., Post-Office.

Vol. XVII

NOVEMBER, 1940

No. 2

A Lesson in Latin Semantics

By NORMAN W. DEWITT

Victoria College, University of Toronto

The last physical frontier may come into knowledge but for human thought there is no last horizon. There is still much to be learned, even about Latin. All the wisdom is not contained in the grammars and dictionaries. The whole truth about a word is not revealed by its etymology nor is the behaviour of a verb confined to voice, mood, tense, number, and person.

The systematic study of meanings, ignored by the grammarians, is called semantics. A minimum of meaning is called a semanteme. This concept is an hypothesis like a point or a straight line in geometry. To discover a pure semanteme is difficult but for practical purposes we may call the word 'love' a semanteme, because it denotes an idea with a minimum of definition; it may be a noun or a verb, and as a verb it teams up indifferently with the pronouns I, you, or they.

If we essay to make conversation with semantemes alone the result is pidgin English: for example, "Dog bark, lady jump." A multitude of English words approximate closely to pure semantemes because they have lost the significant suffixes that prevailed in Anglo-Saxon. The nearest approach to a semanteme in Latin is the present imperative active, such as *ama*, *mone*, *rege*, *audi*, but even these are recognized as imperatives because other parts of the verb are differentiated by terminations. If to *ama* we add the suffix *-tor* the combination gives us *amator*, 'lover.' This *-tor*, like *-er*, denoting the agent or actor, is called a morpheme. Under this term are included all inflections and prefixes; these are so abundant in Latin that no such lingo as pidgin Latin is conceivable.

To begin with the verb, nothing need be said of inflectional morphemes, because they are amply treated in the grammars. The other kind, prefixes, more precisely styled preverbs, still await exhaustive study. The unpounded verb, called the simplex, reveals little about the action. For example, *fugit* means 'he flees' but we are not told how the action ended. If, on the other hand, we write *effugit*, 'he escapes,' the form reveals that the flight succeeded. Even this aspect of the action exhibits variety: thus *confugit* means 'he takes refuge,' *perfugit* 'he reaches safety,' and *transfugit* 'he deserts to the enemy.' Again, *profugit* signifies flight, not to a refuge, but from a danger: Aeneas is *fato profugus* because he is fleeing from Troy. Still different is *defugit*, which implies running away from the post of duty, as in *proelium defugit*. In all of these examples the meaning of the semanteme is neatly defined by the morphemes functioning in pairs, prefix and suffix or preverb and termination.

To offer further illustrations, no ideas seem more ele-

mentary than those expressed by 'sit' and 'stand.' Yet even these exhibit several aspects. Cicero might say to his guests, *residamus*, 'let us be seated,' which implies 'sitting' after 'standing,' a matter of comfort. Again, we find it said of the rowers in a boat, *transtris considunt*, 'they take their places on the benches,' not as a matter of comfort, far from it, but of assuming appointed places. Similarly the bird settles on its nest, *nido considit*. If, once more, the legions take up their position facing the gates and walls of a town, this is denoted by *obsident*, 'they besiege'; if they take up a position in concealment, this is *insident*, 'they sit in ambush,' where the preverb implies hostile intention. Still again, the man who reads Grant's *Memoirs* while his wife takes in washing is guilty of slothfulness, *desidia*, continuing to sit when he ought to be working. Quite different in implication is *desidero*,¹ 'sit a long time, mourn for the dead.' The same extended form may be recognized in *considerant*, 'they sit down together, take counsel, deliberate.'

As for 'stand,' the verbs *sto* and *sisto* contain one and the same semanteme. Its aspects are various. Thus *constitit* means 'he took up his stand,' like the traffic officer at the intersection, while *substitit* means 'he stopped short,' like a man who spies a fifty-cent piece on the sidewalk. Again, *obsto* signifies to 'stand one's ground, face up to a person'; hence 'obstinate,' from *obstino*, an obsolescent form of *obsto*. Quite different is *resisto*: this presents a telescoped meaning, 'stop, turn, and fight back.' *Desisto* we translate 'desist, cease from,' but the true meaning is 'stand aside, withdraw,' as in *incepto desisto*, 'I withdraw from the undertaking.' More subtle are *substo* and *subsisto*, which usually denote continuance in spite of change of qualities: thus the substance of apples subsists in apple-butter and in applesauce, perhaps even in apple-jack. The lexicons quaintly render *institor* as 'huckster, hawker,' but the true meaning is 'high-pressure salesman,' because *insto* and *insisto* mean 'step in another's footprints, pursue, press hard upon,' as of an enemy or a prospective customer.

The semantic behaviour of preverbs forms a diverting topic by itself. Often it is little short of acrobatic. Thus *sub* is to be translated 'up' in *sublevo*, 'lift up,' but 'down' in *supprimo*, 'press down, cause to sink.' We translate *subsilio* 'jump up,' but *subsido* 'settle down, sink to the ground.' We say of the swooning lady, *succumbit*, 'she sinks to the floor,' and of the physician *suscitat*, 'he raises her up, gets her on her feet,' but both verbs exhibit the same preverb *sub*. The question naturally presents itself, How can a preverb exhibit such contrary meanings? The haughty grammarian is not interested. It is the semanticist that furnishes the answer: preverbs perform a function independent of the meaning. Thus *sub lecto* always means 'under the bed,'

but the same preposition, functioning as a preverb, means 'up' if the verb denotes motion from below upward, and 'down' if the verb denotes motion from above downward: thus *suscipio* (*sub-s-cipio*), 'take up, undertake,' but *submergo*, 'put down under the water.' In all these examples the preverb tells us that the action reaches its goal. This is its function.

It makes no difference whether the verb denotes vertical motion up or down or motion on a horizontal line. For example, *copias subduco* means 'withdraw troops,' while *auxilium submitto*, 'despatch aid,' denotes motion in the contrary direction. The point to be observed is this, that *duco* implies motion toward the subject, while *mitto* presumes the opposite. In each case a goal or terminus is implied, irrespective of direction. If the verb is neutral with respect to direction, the preverb furnishes this ancillary idea: *frumentum veho*, 'transport wheat,' suggests nothing about starting point or destination, but *frumentum subveho*, 'deliver wheat,' implies an appointed place, such as a Roman camp.

Deponent verbs offer an amusing and fruitful field for semantic study. For example, *it* means 'he goes' but *progreditur* says 'he marches forward.' Why is the latter deponent? Because it originally means to march with a stride like a soldier. The god of war was called *Mars gradivus*, 'the god that walked with a long stride.' The simplex *gradior* is obsolescent but Virgil employs it of Aeneas for picturesqueness. The form *grassor* survived to denote the swaggering gait of the soldier on leave, *miles gloriosus*. On the other hand, *ambulo* is active in form because it tells us nothing about the manner of walking, whether fast or slow, mincing steps or manly strides. Contrast with this the use of *spatiatur* in *Aeneid* 4. 62:

aut ante ora deum pinguis spatiatur ad aras.

The verb tells us how Dido walked, the queenly grace of her movement. The use of this deponent is comic in *Georgic* 1. 389, where the rook goes for a walk by himself, or rather herself:

et sola in sicca secum spatiatur harena.

It is often the function of the deponent to describe the assumption of a posture: thus *sto* is almost a naked semanteme but *minor* means to draw oneself up to full height, 'threaten.' Again, *fumum olfacio*, 'I smell smoke,' suggests no attitude but *odoror* means to go about sniffing like a hound dog; it shows what one does with the body. *Te amplector* means 'I fold my arms around you'; it is deponent because it implies a posture.

To those people who have street-car minds, which run only along tracks, it might seem as if grammars contained eternal, if not divine, truth. Judged as books, they exhibit a certain imposing austerity and show of finality, not unlike Euclid's treatises on geometry. The truth is that they really are among the most impressive monuments of the human intellect, but none the less they have their defects. One defect is that they eschew all humor; another, and perhaps more serious, is this, that they demonstrate better how the mind of a grammarian works than how the mind of a Roman operated. I predict that grammars of the future will be very different and that semantics will occupy an important place.

¹ [Ed. Note: The following paragraph from the author's "Latin Etymologies," *Language*, Vol. 16, No. 2, April-June, 1940, throws further light on this explanation: "The rustic calendar of the ancients was fixed chiefly by the heliacal settings of the stars. Thus, when Virgil advises, *serva sidera*, this means 'watch the settings,' although we render it 'watch the stars.' The word is manifestly from *sido*, and has shifted from 'setting' to 'star' by a common type of ellipsis, like 'roast' for 'roast of beef.' *Considero* then means 'sit down together, deliberate,' and *desidero*, 'sit a long time, mourn for the dead'; early Roman custom seems to have set the limit at eight days. On sepulchral monuments the mourners are regularly seated."]

The Student of the Classics and Early Christianity

BY JOHN J. GAVIGAN, O.S.A.

Villanova College

In our study of the ancient classics, it may happen that sudden references to Christianity or closely related topics somewhat jar us. They naturally arouse our interest. Take, for example, the supposed correspondence between St. Paul and Seneca. Again, think of the references made by Tacitus and Pliny to the early Christians. Or, perhaps, we may be desirous of working on the early Christian classics on the strength of our classical training.

In all these cases, we naturally appreciate a group of first-class works by competent scholars upon which we can depend for reliable orientation. Does such a group of works really exist? The answer may be in the affirmative but with the ever-recurring 'catch.' Yes, they do exist for one who has a passable knowledge of French and German. Does this mean that these riches must remain buried treasure to all who lack the 'Open, Sesame' of linguistic attainment? Not necessarily; usually a colleague from the French or German Department can be summoned to the rescue. Poor substitute though this may be, I think it is better than nothing. With this in mind, I should like to cite a few standard works that can be consulted profitably by those who wish to draw from the best sources information touching the classics, both Christian and pagan, in their relation to primitive Christianity. In addition, I shall note a few works that bear directly upon the language of the Christian classics, and conclude with a few miscellaneous references. It is understood at the start that the divisions are not ironclad and hence may overlap.

To locate a work in its setting, we depend upon history. Now it happens that we have some excellent works in this subject. The first book to be mentioned is *Histoire Générale de l'Eglise* by F. Mourret, Paris, 1909 ff. This is mentioned first for just one reason: an English translation is being published by Herder Book Company, St. Louis. A better and more complete work is the fine *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos jours*, edited by Fliche and Martin, Paris, 1934 ff. German works include J. P. Kirsch's *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I, Freiburg, 1930, with its fine bibliographies; and Bihlmeyer's shorter work of the same title, Paderborn, 1938. All these works refer to special treatments of particular subjects both in monograph and in article form.

Evidently, we need a unified treatment of our authors if we are to get a comprehensive view. This may be desired from a literary or from a doctrinal angle. If the

former be the case, we have the following: P. De-Labriolle's *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Paris, 1924, (also in a poor English translation by H. Wilson, London and New York, 1925); and A. Puech's, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du IV siècle*, 3 vols., Paris, 1928-30. From a doctrinal point of view (without entire exclusion of the literary), we have many useful handbooks, among which these deserve mention: Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 5 vols., B. Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1913-32; Berthold Altaner, *Patrologie*, *ibid.*, 1938; B. Steidle, *Patrologia* (in Latin), *ibid.*, 1937; J. Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, Paris, 1920 (English translation, Herder, St. Louis, 1923); F. Cayré, *Précis de Patrologie, Histoire et Doctrine des Pères et Docteurs de l'Eglise*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Paris, 1931-33. The last work is excellent for its summaries of doctrine and spirituality from the beginnings of Christianity down to St. Francis de Sales. Vol. I exists in an English translation by H. Howitt, Tournai, 1936. Umberto Moricca has undertaken an ambitious work in his *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*, Turin, 1923 ff. For African writers, Paul Monceaux's learned *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 7 vols., Paris, 1901-23, must not be neglected.

On Christian Institutions we have several excellent encyclopedias. Everyone is, of course, acquainted with the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, to be found, we trust, in every public library. A fine general work is *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 10 vols., Herder, 1930-38. On controversial questions, A. D'Alès' *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*, 4 vols., Paris, 1911-22 (*Table analytique*, 1931), is very helpful. On historico-theological questions, the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Paris, 1899 ff., is a veritable treasure-house of articles by leading European scholars. On questions relating to Scripture, consult F. Vigoroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 5 vols., Paris, 1895-1915, with *Supplément*, 1926 ff. On general historical questions, see *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, Paris, 1909 ff. On Canon Law in its historical aspects, we have Villien-Magnin, *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, Paris, 1909 ff. A recently undertaken work on Spirituality augurs well: Viller, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Paris, 1932 ff. On Liturgy, we have the truly encyclopedic work of Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Paris, 1907 ff. In this last connection, we are glad to mention Fr. Gerald Ellard's work, *Christian Life and Worship*, Bruce, Milwaukee, which has just appeared in a thoroughly revised edition.

So much for the historical part. Now what direct helps have we for the reading and the linguistic interpretation of the early Christian classics? Let us begin with Dictionaries, mentioning only the chief ones.

The great *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig, 1900 ff., is, of course, the standard work for all the letters of the alphabet so far covered. Other important works are the Latin-French Dictionaries of Gaffiot and of Benoist-Goelzer. A fine German work, especially on syntax, is the last edition of Georges, Leipzig, Hahn, 1912-18. Forcellini-Corradini-Perrin, *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, is sadly out of date, but can still render some aid. For

Medieval Latin, Du Cange's *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, 10 vols. (Niort), 1883-1887, is still the most complete work and occasionally helps with its long treatments of certain terms. A useful, though brief, digest of the latter is Maigne d'Arnis' *Lexicon Manuale ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, Paris, 1890. Further references to specifically medieval lexica can be found in Strecker-Woestijne, *Introduction à l'étude du latin médiéval*, Ghent, 1933.

There are several works that explain the language of early Christian writings. The best single grammar is Leumann-Hofmann's *Lateinische Grammatik*, Munich, 1928. *The Catholic University Patristic Studies* (69 vols.) and *The Catholic University Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin* (11 vols.) contain many valuable studies on particular authors. The University of Nijmegen is publishing another series, *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva*, which has likewise offered some valuable contributions to our knowledge in the field of Christian Latin. Other special studies on individual authors are noted in the standard *Histories of Literature* mentioned above.

Lastly, a word on the inevitable "Miscellanea." Two helpful general encyclopedias are the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and the *Encyclopedia Italiana*. One useful series of brief handbooks should also be mentioned: *Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses*, Paris, Bloud and Gay. This contains such fine sketches as Bardy's works on Latin and Greek Christian Literature, Barrois' work on Biblical Archaeology, De Ghellinck's *History of Medieval Latin Literature*, etc.¹

¹ These lists make no pretense of being complete.

"Quid ergo," asked Tertullian, "Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid academiae et ecclesiae? Quid haereticis et Christianis?" For us, for whom the centuries have cleared many an issue, Cardinal Newman has made the appropriate answer, the answer of humanism to inveterate obscurantism: "We attain to heaven by using this world well, though it is to pass away; we perfect our nature, not by undoing it, but by adding to it what is more than nature, and directing it towards aims higher than its own." By 'this world' he meant all that exists in the natural order; and he certainly would have included under it the classical tradition as embodied in literature, the last bequest of a dying civilization to civilizations yet unborn, which to nascent Christianity in the throes of birth appeared so equivocal a gift.—Henry Tristram

The test of a teacher, after all, is his power so to stimulate his students as to raise their interests to a higher level. From the point of view of the college the vital question is not whether a teacher inspires interest, but what kind of interest he inspires and in what quality of undergraduate. The college teacher should strive to interest his more capable men, even at the risk of boring the dullards.—Irving Babbitt

Every man who writes a lucid and interesting prose today owes something to Isocrates.—T. R. Glover

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August and September by
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription price: \$1.00 a year

Entered as second-class matter, at the post-office at St. Louis,
Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S. J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S. J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.
A. A. Jacobsmeyer, S. J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.
Joseph A. Walsh, S. J. Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio
F. A. Sullivan, S. J. St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Francis X. Entz, S. J. St. Charles College, Grand Coteau, La.
Chas. J. Walsh, S. J. Sacred Heart Novitiate, Los Gatos, Cal.
Carol L. Bernhardt, S. J. Weston College, Weston, Mass.

BUSINESS EDITOR

H. L. Brozowski, S. J. St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Vol. XVII

NOVEMBER, 1940

No. 2

Editorial

Apropos of Professor N. W. DeWitt's "A Lesson in Latin Semantics," published in this issue, we reiterate our belief that Latin teachers should take kindly to Linguistics. Its varied uses in the classroom are manifold. We depend upon it for a correct interpretation even of the declensions and conjugations. In presenting these year after year we are apt to drop into routine or short-cut 'explanations' which do not really hold water and must be unlearned in advanced stages of study.¹ Again, regret it as we may, Latin can be neither taught nor studied without the use of an extensive terminology; but the key to that, too, is in the keeping of Linguistics. Linguistics also supplements and simplifies the necessarily brief Grammar or First-Year Latin Book.² *Ago*, for instance, and its compound *ab-igo* may be learnt as two separate items; but an alert teacher may bridge the pair by a timely word on Vowel Weakening—a process that affects hundreds of similar cases. Latin authors of the classical period often intersperse their writing with archaic forms. To say nothing of Sallust and Tacitus, who fairly revel in archaisms, even Cicero draws upon Old Latin, as when he adroitly strikes the keynote of the *De senectute* in the opening sentence:

O Tite, si quid ego adiuvor curamve levasso,
Quae nunc te coquit et versat in pectore fixa,
Equid erit praemi?

Finally, since we must have scholars eminent in Linguistics, might not a language-minded teacher by occasional excursions into this wonderland awaken some young genius of high-school age who is only waiting for the needful stimulus?

If, then, Linguistics is in such great demand, it is obvious that the teacher should be firmly grounded in it. He would, no doubt, invite disaster were he to overwhelm the young learner with technicalities; but unless he knows the whole field, he can hardly make a judicious selection of what to give to, or withhold from, his indi-

vidual class to make his teaching bear the maximum of fruit.

The growth of Linguistics in modern times has been phenomenal.³ There is little more than a century between Franz Bopp's *Conjugationssystem* (1816) and Professor Buck's *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, or Professor Kent's *The Sounds of Latin*, or L. Laurand's *Grammaire historique latine*. But what a difference! From first unsteady gropings Linguistics has risen to the rank of a SCIENCE—with all the rights and privileges appertaining thereunto.

Perhaps the most amazing thing to come home to a student of Linguistics is the regularity which governs phonetic changes over so extensive an area as is covered by the Indo-European languages. Here we have bewildering multiplicity reduced to utter simplicity—on a truly grand scale, and one is impressed with the statement often made, that "language is the proudest creation of the human mind." At all events, Linguistics may well be called in to help us to realize our two great objectives, mental discipline and culture. Linguistics is either dry-as-dust or charged with human interest, according as we handle it. Professor DeWitt's paper is an admirable object lesson.

¹ Quintilian, (II, iii, 1-3), berates the teacher who puts a double burden on his colleague by forcing him to unteach before he can begin to teach (*dedocere-docere*). His famous *quanto melius optimis imbui* is worth pondering.

² Some grammars are more lavish than others in furnishing linguistic information. "Part I: Phonology" in Hale and Buck's *Latin Grammar* is brimful of well-digested matter.

³ See "Linguistics and Classical Philology," by A. H. Fry, *THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN*, October, 1940.

A Study of Act Divisions in Classical Drama, by Reinhard T. Weissinger. Iowa Studies in Classical Philology IX. Privately printed, 4822 Lakeview Drive, Des Moines, Iowa; 1940. Pp. 141. \$3.00.

This monograph begins with and largely turns on definitions of 'act' and their applicability to ancient drama. From English dictionaries and sources German, French, and Italian, the author gleans seven points: that the act is a part, has scenes, is a coherent portion of the plot, is set off by curtain falls, is consecutive when there are no scene changes, and involves a change of setting and entrance or departure of actors. He misses references to lapse of dramatic time between acts and to the proper number of acts, and so adds these two points to make a total of nine. With these as touchstones, he tries out successively Greek tragedy, Old Comedy, New Comedy, Roman comedy, and Roman tragedy, to see how they square with modern practice and use of terms. Modern parallels are added and sometimes the oscillation between the ancient and modern is a little disturbing. Though making these nine points the skeleton of the work, Weissinger uses them in a variety of orders in the several chapters and even sometimes in the synopses at the ends of the chapters, and makes no formal use of them in his somewhat casual general conclusion. This tends to confuse the reader; and, since the act divisions, so to speak, of the chapters are very abrupt, the reader is not helped in the transitions and progress of the thought. My criticism of the

organization must not, however, imply any disparagement of the scholarly substance of the monograph.

A sentence here for each main chapter will suggest the results of the discussion. Acts in Greek tragedy were parts, had scenes though not formally so recognized, were not coherent portions, were consecutive, rarely had changes of setting, were often set off by vacant stages, had condensation of time between acts, with varying number of acts. The μέρη of Old Comedy were less often divided into scenes than were those of tragedy and were not coherent portions of the plot; there was no curtain, and a more continuous performance than of tragedy with fewer empty stages; the frequent changes of setting—mostly imaginary—did not coincide with μέρος divisions but the entrance or departure of actors did; condensation of time occurred at the beginning or end of μέρη, the number of which was indefinite. The insertion of ΧΟΡΟΥ marked off the parts more sharply than in earlier drama, modern editors vary in the number of scenes assigned, the μέρη tended to be coherent portions, there was no curtain; occasional empty stages interrupted consecutive action, there was no change of setting, scenes coincided with the coming and going of actors, there was probably no considerable lapse of time between acts, and five acts were usual. In Roman comedy, groups of scenes, especially when set off by vacant stages, are roughly equivalent to modern acts, scene divisions were formally indicated by ancient scene headings, acts were fairly coherent portions, there was no curtain, many vacant stages interrupt continuity of performance, change of setting was rare, scene divisions were accompanied by entrance or departure of actors, there was frequent lapse of dramatic time—not necessarily between acts, and the number of acts varied from three to six. Seneca's plays were divided into acts so intended by him, there were scene headings but editors differ as to the number of scenes, acts were reasonably coherent, there was a curtain unless these are closet dramas, empty stages and perhaps the curtain broke the continuity, change of setting was usually avoided, an empty stage usually marked the end of an act as well as a scene, lapse of dramatic time was frequent, and there were five acts.

This synopsis does scant justice to the erudition of the monograph. There is an extensive bibliography but no index. The amount of statistical matter is large, and some corrections had to be made in long hand. I noticed only one typographical error, and the typography is very attractive.

Northwestern University

CLYDE MURLEY

The Future of Classical Study

"What is the best must be the true; and what is true—that is, what is at bottom fit and agreeable to the constitution of man—must at last prevail over all obstruction and all opposition. It is the tendency of the true interest of man to become his desire and steadfast aim."

Are not the classics 'the best' and 'the true'? Are they not 'at bottom fit and agreeable to the constitution of man'? We are in good hopes, then, that Emerson's prophecy may yet come true.

The Correspondence of Cicero

By P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON
Princeton University

Since of Cicero's extant correspondence only 12 letters can be dated between 68 and 64 and since no letter survives from 63, the collection virtually begins with the return of Pompey from the East in 62 and ends in 43 with the rise of Octavian to power. The letters are distributed among 37 books, as follows: 16 books of *Epistulae ad Atticum*, 16 books of *Epistulae ad Familiares*, 3 books of *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem*, and 2 books of *Epistulae ad Brutum*. So far every modern editor of Cicero's correspondence is in accord; but no agreement has yet been achieved about (1) the precise number of letters in the collection in respect to either those composed by Cicero or those written by others to him, (2) the chronological sequence of the surviving letters, (3) the authenticity of certain letters, and (4) the number and the ascription of the lost books of the correspondence.

Without delving into too great detail these difficulties may be described thus:

(1) The extant epistles amount to about 925, of which about 125 letters were written by 32 persons other than Cicero. We cannot arrive at an exact number, because the several editors deal differently with certain letters, e. g. (to give only one example from each collection), some print *Fam.* 12.15 as a whole and others divide it into two parts: §§1-6 and §7, some give *Brut.* 1.3 as a unit and others separate it into two sections: §§1-3 and §4, some treat *Att.* 12.38 as a whole and others cut it into two halves: §§1-2 and §§3-4, some combine *Q.F.* 3. 5 and 6 into one letter and others follow the manuscriptal tradition.

(2) While less than 20 letters are classified as of uncertain date and cannot be dated accurately to the satisfaction of most modern scholars, many letters can be placed only in certain seasons or months by means of internal evidence, which is not always interpreted uniformly by the investigators.

(3) For a long time it was thought that the *Epistulae ad Brutum* were forged; but it is now almost universally accepted that with a few exceptions these letters are genuine. Also contained in the *corpus* are a long letter from Cicero to Octavian, the authenticity of which no one would deem worthy of defence, and an essay entitled *De Petitione Consulatus*, which competent critics now confer upon Cicero's brother Quintus.

(4) About 36 more books of Cicero's letters are believed to have been in existence, apportioned approximately as follows: 4 to Pompey, 3 to Caesar,¹ 3 to Octavian,¹ 3 to Pansa (consul in the last year of Cicero's life), 9 to Hirtius (Pansa's colleague in the consulship),² 7 to Brutus, 2 to Nepos, 2 to Marcus (Cicero's son), 2 to Axius (a banker), and 1 (at least) to Calvus (an orator and a poet). Moreover, we have references to letters to Cato (other than those extant), to Caerellia (a female friend of Cicero), to Hostilius (unknown), to Titinius (not definitely identifiable), and to epistles written in Greek. From all these lost Latin letters there have been found (mainly in the writings of grammarians and of rhetoricians) about 100 fragments, of which

almost half are assigned to the correspondence with Octavian.

The theory that T. Pomponius Atticus, who outlived Cicero by 11 years, published the letters addressed by Cicero to him has long been abandoned. The current consensus is that Atticus arranged the letters in his possession and during his life postponed their publication. Some speculation has been spent on the decision for this delay on the part of a publisher such as Atticus. The most plausible proposal seems to be that Atticus, averse from offending Octavian, with whom he was most intimate (cf. Nepos, *Att.* 20. 1-3), was reluctant to release Cicero's letters at a time when factional feeling was still strong. However this may have been, Atticus appears to have transmitted this collection of letters to his literary executors, who may have excised a few epistles, for the general opinion is that there were not many more letters in the collection which Atticus preserved than in the collection (numbering about 450) which we possess. On the other hand, fortune has not been so lenient with the letters which Atticus addressed to Cicero, for there is extant no epistle in its entirety. Nevertheless, there have been found a few fragments in the form of words and phrases and sentences cited by Cicero in his answers to Atticus.³

The earliest quotation from the *Epistulae ad Atticum* (which extend over a period of 24 years: from 68 to 44) is made by Seneca in one of his *Letters* (*Ep.* 97. 4) written in 63 or 64. This fact has led several scholars to suggest that the actual publication of these letters did not occur till about a century after Cicero's death, when there was far less likelihood of running a risk by circulating such severe strictures on Caesar as are contained in the *Letters to Atticus* than there would have been earlier in the empire. Despite the doubt about the date we can be confident that the editor (or editors) divided the *Epistulae ad Atticum* into books, since this arrangement not only was known to Nepos,⁴ who died about 7 years after Atticus, but also is confirmed by the ancient citations from this collection. The editor appears to have adopted a chronological order to the best of his ability save in Books 12 and 13. Of interest are the intervals between some of the books: in certain cases many months confound the continuity of the correspondence. To account for the absence of letters from the collection in such seasons it is commonly conjectured that Atticus either was resident in Rome and received no letters at those times or decided later not to divulge the letters delivered to him during those periods.

Tradition tells us that the rest of Cicero's correspondence was prepared for publication by his freedman, M. Tullius Tiro, who survived Cicero by 40 years; so it is appositely allowed that he had ample time to accomplish his task. While Atticus (as we have seen) because of his relations with Octavian had personal reasons leading him to refrain from publishing Cicero's letters to him, Tiro rested under no such restraint from preparing for publication the letters which were among his patron's papers. Even so, it is quite probable that Tiro thought it wise to suppress some letters which denounced Octavian's defection from the republican ranks for the faction of Antony.

While it is generally granted that Tiro edited all of Cicero's correspondence except the *Epistulae ad Atticum*, yet we have testimony that Cicero himself toyed with the thought of preparing a small selection of his letters for publication. In a letter dated 9 July 44 Cicero says: "Of my letters there is no collection, but Tiro has nearly 70; and some can be obtained from you. These I should examine and correct. Only then they may be published" (*Att.* 16.5.5). However, whether this συναγωγή (as Cicero calls it) was completed or what epistles it comprised, if it was copied for circulation, no one either in antiquity knew or knows now. Some scholars have displayed much diligence in confidently identifying this collection and in vindicating their verdict against the censure of other critics; but it is simpler to suppose that in the 17 months of life left to Cicero there was little leisure for him to perfect this project, since his energy, when not engaged in seeking to save the State, was employed in his philosophical pursuits, and that Tiro turned to this task with devoted duty and eventually elaborated it into a magnificent monument to his master's memory.

A survey of the 16 books of the collection now known as the *Epistulae ad Familiares* (numbering about 430 letters) shows that Tiro took no consistent course in combining their contents into an harmonious whole. Instead various plans were pursued. Some books consist chiefly of collected letters sent to certain correspondents, but also contain several letters addressed to others usually added at the end (e. g., 1 and 2).⁵ Other books comprise only letters to or from single correspondents (e. g., 3,8,14,16). Other books exhibit an exchange of epistles with several friends (e. g., 7,9-12). For some books Tiro selected letters on the same subject, sometimes with signal success (e. g., 13 or 15), but through several books he also scattered letters on the same subject (e. g., 4-6). Though it is obvious that Tiro tried to arrange the letters concerning the same correspondent in a kind of chronological sequence, yet the event was not equal to the effort and, moreover, in some books (e. g., 5,7,13,15,16) it seems that he suspended his system.

Since the 3 books of *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem* pertain to such a short period (60-54), the prevalent presumption is that we possess only a part (about 25 letters) of the fraternal correspondence. Nor are we certain that we have even all the letters addressed in this interval by Cicero to Quintus. On the other hand, in the *Epistulae ad Familiares* we find some letters (4: written 53-44) from Quintus to Cicero or to Tiro. Knowing how faithful was the freedman to this family, we may suspect that Tiro suppressed several epistles exchanged by the brothers, who were estranged during the Civil War, on the good ground that these letters lent themselves to unbrotherly utterances.

The extant 2 books of *Epistulae ad Brutum* (numbering about 25 letters) come from Cicero's correspondence with the conspirator and cover only 4 months in 43. For more than a century a fierce controversy had been fought over the genuineness of these letters, till about a half-century ago the tide of hostile criticism was turned and today only 2 of these epistles (1. 16 and 17) still attract attackers of their authenticity. Among the

Epistulae ad Familiares Tiro also saved space for 5 letters from Brutus to Cicero and for 2 letters from Brutus and Cassius to Antony.⁶

R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, the Dublin professors who produced their excellent English edition of Cicero's Correspondence (published in 7 parts 1879-1901 and revised 1884-1933), print 932 letters, which include the long letter supposed once to have been written by Cicero to Octavian and the essay on electioneering now said to have been written by Quintus to Marcus. The editors brand 18 letters as of uncertain date, though they either attempt to date these or give the results of others' researches in this field. For the statistically-minded it may be remarked that of the remaining 914 letters with accurate dates more than one-third (387) fall within the last 3 years of Cicero's career (45-43) and that more than two-thirds (617) belong to the 7 years between the outbreak of the Civil War and Cicero's death (49-43).

¹ That these 6 books belong only to the correspondence with either Caesar or Octavian is the suggestion of some scholars.

² Some critics consider this number excessive for a correspondence which covered only 3 years, while both correspondents were in Rome for most of that period.

³ An Italian scholar, Santi Consoli, in his edition of *T. Pomponii Attici Epistularum ad Ciceronem Reliquiae* (Rome 1913), has extracted from Cicero's correspondence evidence of 223 epistles from Atticus to Cicero. Among these are 42 from which Consoli has collected Atticus' *ipsisima verba*,—in quotations ranging from 1 word to 48 words in length.

⁴ *Att.* 16. 3. Nepos seems to have read the *Letters*, for he enlarges (§4) upon their historical interest. However, it can not be established from his words that the collection was available to the public. In composing his *Life of Atticus* Nepos doubtlessly was permitted to inspect the letters among Atticus' other papers.

⁵ That this arrangement argues for their publication in separate parts is shown by the system of citation common among the ancient authors, who style the several books after the correspondent whose letter stands first in the book. A modern author assembles sometimes several essays in one volume to which he attaches as a title the name of the first essay. Cf. Paul Elmer More, *The Demon of the Absolute* (Princeton 1928), which has 6 essays subsequent to the first, whose title names the book.

⁶ Beside these 7 letters there exists a series of 70 letters in Greek attributed to Brutus with replies to them from the recipients. Only a few of these may be genuine in the opinion of R. E. Smith, who has delivered the latest decision on this collection in *Classical Quarterly* 30 (1936) 194-203.

The Classics and the Humanities

By ROBERT V. CRAM
University of Minnesota

Invited to write an article for the CLASSICAL BULLETIN on the value of the study of the classics, I was at first tempted to decline. What could I possibly say that has not been already better said on countless occasions? And yet, when one has been a student of Latin and Greek since one's earliest high-school days at the dawn of the century and when one has been teaching Latin for a quarter of a century, one may be justified in stating certain opinions which have been forming for nearly forty years.

In the *Interpreter* for April, 1940, one of my colleagues in the English Department, Professor Elizabeth Jackson, published a trenchant article in defense of the teaching of English grammar. The following remarks on the value of the opinions of experienced teachers versus educational statistics seem to me highly pertinent:

"I have been told by the extreme devotees of educa-

tional statistics . . . that the educational world is not interested in personal opinions. It is interested in *facts*, and I have been told that the *only* facts we have are the facts of specific pieces of statistical research. Is it wise, I wonder, for the educational world to disregard entirely the reports of its practicing teachers?"

Some educational psychologists claim that there is very little evidence for the transfer of training in the study of Latin or mathematics to any other subject. At the risk of being ridiculed as a *laudator temporis acti*, I would still affirm my belief that the average of my contemporaries who had the prescribed four years of high-school Latin could think more clearly and had a better mastery and understanding of their own language than those without this training.

Cicero's tribute to the value of the classics is as true today as the day he uttered it—*Quam multas nobis imagines non solum ad intuendum, verum etiam ad imitandum fortissimorum virorum expressas scriptores et Graeci et Latini reliquerunt!*—but this is a very practical age, and I must speak in very practical terms.

After twenty years as a teacher of Latin at a great University, it is my considered opinion that there has been a slow but steady decline in the working knowledge of English possessed by most of the students in this university. Each year I am more surprised and appalled at their ignorance or confused knowledge of words, many of which are in common use. I sometimes wonder seriously how much the average student understands of what he hears and reads after the incredible blunders I have heard from some of the most intelligent.

Nor do I suppose for a moment that this situation is local. It is significant that in his report for 1938-39 President Conant stated: "From all sides, academic and non-academic, we hear complaints of the inability of the average Harvard graduate to write either correctly or fluently." I wonder if one of the major causes of this situation is not the lack of a workable English vocabulary. I would unhesitatingly state that there is a direct connection between this and the lack of the old classical training. Be this as it may, there can be no question that the study of Latin does give a student a feeling for language and a knowledge of the basic meaning of most of our English words.

At the recent meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Professor Oldfather read a paper¹ in which he showed that the use of words of Germanic origin is increasingly disappearing in favor of words of Latin origin.

However, it may be objected that my bias in favor of the classics robs my words of all their weight. Let us see, then, what a few outsiders have to say. Most heartening is the report adopted by the English Department of the University of Iowa after a study which lasted over a year and which was endorsed by 35 out of 38 departments of English:

"The high school subjects that lead most certainly to success in the collegiate and professional study of English appear to be the following:

"Latin and French or German. The student should have secured a good understanding of the Latin language, its grammar and syntax, of the relation of Latin

and English, and of Roman civilization and literary art as exemplified by the *Aeneid*.

"It is the well-considered opinion of the Departments further, that, as preparation for the higher study of English, high school work in foreign languages and history is as valuable as high school work in English itself.

"The study of Greek still remains the best training for the study of modern literatures. . . .

"As the first foreign language, Latin is usually a wise choice. Since it was long the language of learning in Western Europe, it is a necessary tool for research in many fields. But it has, too, great practical and cultural values; for many of our common words and technical words come from the Latin and *even our ordinary speech is enriched and refined by a precise knowledge of its sources*" (italics mine).

In a little book that should be read and reread by every lover of the classics, Douglas Bush, Professor of English at Harvard University, writes (*The Renaissance and English Humanism*, p. 131): "We are all agreed, I suppose, that education nowadays is in a state of chaos. We do not know what we are doing or why we are doing it," and again (p. 132): "In recent times we have witnessed the virtual extinction of the classics, and at present even the modern humanities are yielding ground daily to the social sciences. . . . One may wonder timidly if a real revival of the humanities might not be inaugurated by a moratorium on productive scholarship—not too long a moratorium . . . but long enough to restore our perspective and sense of values."

Professor Greene of Princeton University, chairman of the committee appointed by the Council of Learned Societies to study the status of the humanities in the various institutions of learning, has recently completed his investigation. In a most stimulating address he stated that the fundamental issue of human life is to realize the value of human dignity, and that the fundamental requisites for the realization of human dignity are truth, beauty, and moral goodness. In his opinion these could best be attained through humanistic studies in which he would include mathematics, natural science, history, and philosophy as well as a study of the classical languages, social sciences, art and literature.

Surely here is a definition of the fundamental purpose of life with which we would agree and a curriculum for a humanistic education to which teachers of classics would subscribe.

May I conclude with the words used by Miss Jackson in the conclusion of her defense of grammar, merely substituting in brackets the word *Latin* for her word *grammar*. "If modern education pursues its triumphant course to its illogical conclusion, there will be no thinkers to banish. In that future day the books will have become innocuous because there will be no one left with the skill to read them. Don't think that I believe that [Latin] by itself can save a democracy . . . I merely regard [Latin, or, if you will, the Classical Languages] as one of the salients on the intellectual frontier. It is a point that can be fortified and defended. And I set it down as a personal opinion which may or may not be supported by statistical data, that in the struggle that lies ahead of us, any defense is worth fighting for."

¹ Expected to appear in *The Kentucky State Teachers' Journal* in October.

Classical Myths That Live Today. By Frances A. Sabin. Revised and Enlarged Edition. N. Y., Silver Burdett Company, 1940. Pp. xxvi, 348, lxii. \$1.96.

Miss Sabin, associate professor emeritus of Education, New York University, and for many years energetic director of The Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, is one of America's most active proponents of the vitality of the classics. The first edition of her *Classical Myths That Live Today* appeared in 1927; the book throughout lived up to the implications of its title—the handling of classical mythology with particular emphasis upon the use of classical allusions in later and contemporary words and expressions, literature, art and decorative design, the business world, and cartoons. The revised edition exceeds its predecessor by twenty-four pages, the additions occurring in the introductory material and the appendix. However, there are many changes through the body of the text as well, represented by substitutions of recent literary allusions and by the inserting of additional or revised illustrations. Thus the earlier vase illustration on page 35 is replaced by Frances Reubelt's graceful "To a Grasshopper," an adaptation of one of the more appealing of the *Anacreontea*; on page 67 one finds now an illustration of "The president's medal of the National Safety Council," with its embodiment of the "Fates" motif; page 299 has in the revised edition a full-page illustration, "Hereules slays the Hydra," while on page 230 the earlier "Margaret Anglin as Medea" has been replaced with an illustration of the Argonauts passing through the Clashing Rocks. These are but a few of many like instances. Particularly helpful features of both the earlier and the revised editions should be noted again—such as the "Who's Who in Classical Mythology," "A Summary of Expressions," and the "Index" with its "Key to Pronunciation," as well as the general plan of presentation, which is almost invariably to arrange the narratives about personages prominent in classical mythology.

Saint Louis University WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER

Ciceronianism Good and Bad

Guided by the natural light of reason, the Greeks' and his own, Cicero had brought moral philosophy, *sapientia*, to the threshold of Christianity. It was Cicero who led the brilliant worldling, Augustine, to God. It was Cicero, along with such a partial disciple as Augustine, who led Petrarch and Ficino and others to Plato and Christian Platonism. When Cicero is almost deified as a moral teacher, a teacher of unique urbanity and sweetness and light, *imitation* of his style and the minute study of rhetoric appear in their proper perspective.

We must not consider *Renaissance Ciceronianism* as merely a stylistic fad satirized by Erasmus and justly denounced by Bacon. Imitation of Ciceronian Latin for its own sake did sometimes run to absurd excess, but that outbreak of neoclassical measles was confined to a small number of men.—Douglas Bush, *The Renaissance and English Humanism*. The University of Toronto Press, 1939. P. 60.

